

Remarks

This letter is in response to the Office Action mailed June 10, 2010. Claims 32-34 and 36-39 have been amended. New claims 42-44 have been added.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 32-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,287,227 (Ries et al.). Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections because Ries et al. does not teach or suggest all claimed elements.

Specifically, each of amended independent claims 32, 37, and new independent claims 42 and 44, indicates that publishing comprises uploading at least one file as edited/created at the client. On the other hand, Ries et al. describes a client-side editing interface that provides a change list used by *server-side components* to update files.

See, for example, col. 8, lines 50-61 of Ries et al.: “Edit mode 144 assembles the edits that have been performed by the editing client 140, as well as the corresponding hooks that define each edited area, and submits the data to the backend application logic 138. The *backend application logic 138 analyzes* the hooks to determine the proper data store that must be modified with the updated value. *Given changes submitted by edit mode 144* are made to the appropriate data sources...” (emphasis added). Thus, it appears that Ries et al. does not upload a file as edited at the client; rather, the Ries et al. edit mode 144 submits changes

made in the editing window, with backend application logic 138 analyzing the changes and making appropriate changes at the server.

See also col. 9, lines 39-55 (discussing “save brain processes 208”— “...edits and associated hook data are passed back to the save brain 208 from the client side edit mode components 222. The save brain uses these data to perform lookups on the hook data store 218, which is used to correlate hook data with one or more given data stores where data identified for editing resides.”). See also col. 11, describing components of edit mode including save script 238 and save frame 244 “provided in order to exchange edit data between edit mode 222 and the edit brain 202...”). Col. 13 of Reiss et al. notes that FTP information “allows the *edit brain* (shown in Fig. 2 at the server) to access the file system on the web server where web pages and other data are maintained.” Col. 16, lines 1-18 describes the save process as “compil[ing] the edits made by the editing client, in combination with data comprising the hooks that encapsulate the edited data, into an update message...”

In contrast, and as noted above, the present claims indicate that a client-side application is used to upload one or more files edited (or created) at the client. As noted at page 6, paragraph [0014] of the present specification, embodiments can operate by *downloading* source files for a web site, editing the *downloaded* source files, and then publishing the files to the web site in a “single, seamless page

editor.” See also paragraph [0030] at page 10 (“Once the target web page has been scanned, the underlying source file for the target web page is downloaded via the file transfer server in step 303, along with any of the related, page-dependent files or links...In step 306, the source file for the edited Web page along with any of its dependencies that were modified or that are not already on the file transfer server...In step 307, the edited Web page and all of the new or modified dependent files are uploaded to the Web site through the file transfer server.”) (emphasis added).

See also page 12, paragraph [0038] (“Once the appropriate files have been downloaded to computer 500, the user may edit as desired. In some cases, the user may choose to add or delete dependent files or even entire Web pages. When such files are added, they would be stored locally on local storage 509. As the user edits the Web pages, the links to the appropriate new files and pages would reference the URL to local storage 509”) and paragraph [0039] (“Moreover, any links within the modified Web page to files that had been added and stored locally during the editing process will be updated to reflect the appropriate file transfer addresses appropriated for those files, or their links would be removed if the associated file was also deleted.”).

In contrast, Ries et al. relies on server-side components that inject “hooks” into web pages and provide client-side editing logic, relying again on the server-side components to actually update files in accordance with an “update message.”

Ries et al. state that their invention “provides for client side editing of structured documents, e.g., web pages, provided by one or more servers, e.g., web servers, and server side modification of data used by the one or more servers to provide the structured documents in accordance with the client side editing.” Col. 3, lines 30-42. Assignee respectfully asserts that modifying Ries et al. to operate as a client-side application would render the invention of Ries et al. unsuitable for its intended purpose.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully asserts Ries et al. would not have rendered the presently-claimed subject matter obvious under 103 and therefore the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

No additional fees are believed due at this time. If any additional fees are believed due for this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any refund to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

If there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned directly at 404.745.2447

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 10, 2010

/Eric G Zaiser/

Eric G. Zaiser
Reg. No. 58,352

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree St. NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
404.745.2447 (voice)
404.541.3290 (fax)